

**REMARKS**

Claims 10 to 20 are now pending.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested based on the following.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO 1449 paper and cited references.

Claim 20 has been rewritten to depend from claim 19, correcting a typographical error.

Claims 10 to 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,031,484 to "Bullinger et al." or U.S. Patent No. 6,043,772 to "Voigtlaender et al." or U.S. Patent No. 6,335,700 to "Ashihara" or U.S. Patent No. Application 2004/0012516 to "Schiffmann et al." or U.S. Patent No. 6,727,844 to "Zimmermann et al."

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102, a single prior art reference must identically disclose each and every claim feature. See Lindeman Maschinenfabrik v. American Hoist and Derrick, 730 F.2d 1452, 1458 (Fed. Cir. 1984). If any claim feature is absent from a prior art reference, it cannot anticipate the claim. See Rowe v. Dror, 112 F.3d 473, 478 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

It is respectfully submitted that the "Bullinger" reference does not identically disclose (or even suggest) the feature of "at least two sensors, **each having a locating depth of at least 50 m,**" in which the "at least two sensors are arranged in such a way on both sides of a longitudinal center axis of the motor vehicle that locating angular ranges of the at least two sensors together cover an entire vehicle width as of a first distance, and overlap each other as of a second distance." The "Bullinger" reference merely refers to Doppler radar measuring devices 5.1, 5.2 having a sensing range limitation of **1-2 meters**. (Col. 5, lines 1 to 3). Thus, the "Bullinger" reference fails to describe the above feature of claim 10.

It is respectfully submitted that the "Voigtlaender" reference does not identically disclose (or even suggest) the feature of "at least two sensors, **each having a locating depth of at least 50 m,**" in which the "at least two sensors are arranged in such a way on both sides of a longitudinal center axis of the motor vehicle that locating angular ranges of **the at least two sensors together cover an entire vehicle width as of a first distance,** and overlap each

other as of a second distance.” The “Voigtlaender” refer refers to a multi-beam automobile radar system, but fails to describe a coverage of the sensors in relation to a vehicle width. The Applicants respectfully submit the Office Action has not asserted the “Voigtlaender” reference describes a locating depth of the sensors, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter.

It is respectfully submitted that the “Ashihara” reference does not identically disclose (or even suggest) the feature of “at least two sensors, each having a locating depth of at least 50 m,” in which the “at least two sensors are arranged in such a way on both sides of a longitudinal center axis of the motor vehicle that locating angular ranges **of the at least two sensors together cover an entire vehicle width as of a first distance**, and overlap each other as of a second distance.” The “Ashihara” reference does not describe a coverage of the transmitting and receiving units in relation to a vehicle width, as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter.

It is respectfully submitted that the “Schiffmann” reference does not identically disclose (or even suggest) the feature of “at least two sensors, **each having a locating depth of at least 50 m**,” in which the “at least two sensors are arranged in such a way on both sides of a longitudinal center axis of the motor vehicle that locating angular ranges of the at least two sensors together cover an entire vehicle width as of a first distance, and overlap each other as of a second distance,” as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter.

It is respectfully submitted that the “Zimmermann” reference does not identically disclose (or even suggest) the feature of “at least two sensors, **each having a locating depth of at least 50 m**,” in which the at least two sensors are arranged in such a way on both sides of a longitudinal center axis of the motor vehicle that locating angular ranges of the at least two sensors together cover an entire vehicle width as of a first distance, and overlap each other as of a second distance,” as provided for in the context of the claimed subject matter. The “Zimmermann” reference refers to near distance sensors with a range of **7 meters**. (Col. 6, lines 42-43.)

Accordingly, claim 10 is allowable, as are its dependent claims 11 to 17.

Independent claim 18, as presented, includes features like those of claim 10 and is therefore allowable for essentially the same reasons as claim 10.

Claims 19 and 20 depend from claim 18, and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 18.

In summary, all pending claims are allowable.

**CONCLUSION**

In view of the foregoing, all pending claims are allowable. It is therefore respectfully requested that the objection and rejections be withdrawn. Prompt reconsideration and allowance of the present application are therefore respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON LLP

Dated: 6/20/07

By: Gerard A. Messina

Gerard A. Messina  
(Reg. No. 35,952)

One Broadway  
New York, NY 10004  
(212) 425-7200

**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**

1363711